



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,953	09/08/2003	Regina A. Cetrangelo	CETR200	8765
23590	7590	09/05/2006	EXAMINER	
RICHARD L HUFF 19304 OLNEY MILL ROAD OLNEY, MD 20832			EL ARINI, ZEINAB	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1746	

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/656,953

Applicant(s)

CETRANGELO, REGINA A.

Examiner

Zeinab E. EL-Arini

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

In the specification, page 1, paragraph 1, line 2, after "2002", -", now abandoned,"- should be inserted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 5 are incomplete, because element for cleaning the dental instruments has not been recited.

In claims 9 and 10, line 5, "the pointed end" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallock et al. (5,471,706) in combination with Williams (4,362,241).

Wallock et al. disclose a device for cleaning dental instrument comprising a container containing bristles, and a finger grip ribs 22. The reference discloses that the container includes guard loop 50, and guard collar 45, and protective rim. The reference does not teach the container includes gauze, the stem, and the prongs as claimed. See col. 3, line 65- col. 4, line 2, col. 5, lines 3-10, 57-59, 29-37, and the claims.

Williams discloses an apparatus for disinfection of dental instruments. The reference discloses the container and the gauze inside the container. See Figs. 1 and 7, col. 4, lines 61-67, and col. 5, lines 14-25.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the gauze taught by Williams in the Wallock et al. container to improve the cleaning. This is because both references are from the same technical endeavor which is cleaning medical instruments. The stem and prongs are inherent in the Wallock et al. cleaning apparatus.

5. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cerroni (5,704,088) in combination with Wallock et al and Williams.

Cerroni discloses a method and apparatus for cleaning dental instruments. The reference discloses holding the device in one hand, placing the dental instrument inside the open container, putting the pointed tip of the dental instrument in contact with the bristles, and wiping the tip of the instrument. See col. 3, lines 1-38. The reference

Art Unit: 1746

discloses the objectives and advantages of the invention to provide an apparatus has many sizes and many geometric volume configurations. See col. 5, lines 21-34.

The reference does not teach the container containing gauze, the girth, and the prongs as claimed.

Wallock et al. disclose a device for cleaning dental instrument comprising a container containing bristles, and a finger grip ribs 22. The reference discloses that the container includes guard loop 50, and guard collar 45, and protective rim. The reference does not teach the container includes gauze, the stem, and the prongs as claimed. See col. 3, line 65- col. 4, line 2, col. 5, lines 3-10, 57-59, 29-37, and the claims.

Williams discloses an apparatus for disinfection of dental instruments. The reference discloses the container and the gauze inside the container. See Figs. 1 and 7, col. 4, lines 61-67, and col. 5, lines 14-25.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the gauze taught by Williams in the Wallock et al. container to improve the cleaning. This is because both references are from the same technical endeavor which is cleaning medical instruments. The stem and prongs are inherent in the Wallock et al. cleaning apparatus.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the gauze taught by Williams in the Cerroni apparatus to obtain the claimed process.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Gibbs et al. (US 2003/0029474) disclose method and apparatus for cleaning dental instruments. Giampaolo, Jr. (5,639,310) discloses method for manually disinfecting and cleaning post or pierced earrings. Montiel (4,530,726) discloses fingernail refinishing product and method. Schang (5,997,655) discloses panel-washing device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zeinab E. EL-Arini whose telephone number is (571) 272-1301. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1746

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Zeinab El-Arini

Zeinab E. EL-Arini
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1746

ZEE
8/28/06